L 7 1744-94

P2-1

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895-96

191 .

(Mund.)

File No. 21-95

Serial Nos. 2-13

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

M ~~Part~~ B for September 96

SUBJECT.

Forfeiting certain lands in Seringapatnam to the Govt owing to the nonfulfillment of the Conditions of its gran

Indexed

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 28-1-19

1st Counsellor's order

"Is there anything to shew that when the site was 10 years old back it was sold on the express condition that if not built upon within a fixed time the site will be resumed or forfeited to Govt Let me see the original sale list if here"

Memo

As directed, the Dy Com was requested to submit papers on the subject. From the papers accordingly received the following facts are gathered

(a) Para III of the Mil Boards Pro Dy 27/8/04 fixes the conditions of the grant of sites.

(1) That construction of houses should be commenced within 6 months from the date of purchase

(2) Two years time was allowed for persons building terraced houses, 18 months time to persons building detached houses

Should any of the purchasers of sites failed to keep up to the above conditions ~~&c~~ and allow their sites to lie waste, the Municipal Board would ~~&c~~ resume the sites and dispose of them in public auction.

(b) Notice from the Vice

Subject to Govt.

So early as 1885 and 1887, notices had been issued to the persons in poss[n] of the site that the conditions of the grant had been violated. I submit therefore that there has been no waiver on the part of Govt

12/9

Sealed Bid Ord.

14-9-96

10/9

in my mind
only
is not a free from doubt. Dy C
compensation should admit that Govt
under Hook I dep[n] the Lessees
when the order as
passed when many years as
old, but they have a right
in the settlement.

14/9/96

President by 12/6/85 states that as the purchasers of sites failed to begin the construction of their houses within 6 months as stipulated or within 15 days after the extension of time subsequently allowed, they were required to remit their purchase money immediately, otherwise the same would be forfeited to the Mty.

Notice circ 384 by 20/9/87 requiring the purchasers to build houses within 60 days from the receipt of the notice otherwise the lands would be resumed.

To avoid delay perusal of the whole correspondence is not undertaken

Other petitions circs 3493, 877/3/96, 1472 by 15/10/95, 2580 6/1/96 & 646 by 13/10/96, the last of which containing the Secy's orders directing their submission after the Dy Comrs reply. are herewith submitted for orders

By 12/9/96

The file is in the Local Boards Branch

MR 24/10

No. 1472

Name of Petitioner, Purohit Sreenivasa

Village, Kuveba

Taluk, Seringapatam

District, Mysore

Date of Arzi, 15-10-95

Date of Receipt, 18-10-95

Date of Disposal,

No of Enclosure,

MR 24/10

The file is before Hs & the Dewan

HR 25/10

Firmaned to the Asst Secretary with the Dewan for being placed in the file. ZP. 18/10/95

Section Mysore

File No 71-3

Serial No 62

To the Dewan Regd No 3721 of 9-11-1896

ABSTRACT.

State that a certain site of a house to the west of the Sandal Kote at Seringapatam was sold in auction to one Timmula Neshe; that after his death the same was bought by him Petr for Rs 432; that then he with six others beg to build houses and actua collected the materials therefor and paid the requisite advances to coolies; that th he was prevented by the Comr from building the house and was told that th

site was needed for the use of the Dewan Bahadur that ~~subsequently~~. that subsequently he was told by the Councillor that since the site was wanted by the Dewan, the ~~P~~ Proc^s of the case had been sent to him; that lately he was told by the Dewan that the site was wanted for the construction of a chultram and that the Pet^r would be given the same extent of land in such places as he may select.

Prays:-

(1) That in case that he is prevented from building his house on the spot, ~~that~~ the sales of all the other sites ~~not~~ now confirmed may be cancelled and acquired by Govt:

(2) That in case the others are permitted to build their houses he may also be allowed to do the same. site

(3) That he should be given the same extent of land in such places as he may select

4) That the cost materials bought for the use, the advances given to ~~of~~ coolies and other costs together with interest should be paid to him.

Petn presented
28/10/25

ಕಾಡುವ ಅಂಧಕಾರ

ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಕತ್ತಲೆಯಂಗಿದ ಕಲ್ಲು ಅಂಧ
ಇಲ್ಲಿ ೧೦೦ನ್ನು ಕಲು ಕಾಂದ ಕೆಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಳಿದ್ದ ಕಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾಂಲಿತಾ
ಡಿಲ್ಲು ನ ನೈಲವ ಕಾಳಿಲ್ಲಿ ಎದುರಲ್ಲಿ ದಾಳಿ ಗಾಲ್ಲ ತೆಗದ
ರ ಚಾಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಕ್ಷಣ್ಣ ರದುವರ ನೆಂ ಚಂಗಂಚಿ ಗಿನೆ ಳ್ಳಕ ಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಲ್ಲಿ ಗಂ
ಅಕಾರಿಸ್ಸು ಕ ಧೆಯ್ಯಿ ಚಿಟ್ಟು ನ ದಿರಾ ಲು ಲಾಂಡಾಗಿದ್ದ ಚಾಂಕಾರ
ಖಲ್ಲಂಗಿದ್ದಾ ಸಾಂ ಸಗ್ಗಿಸ್ಟಾಳ್ಳಾದ ಕೆ ಕಾರ್ ಲ್ಲೂಲಿಂ ಲು ಲ್ಲಿ ಲು ಧ್ವನ್ನಿ
ತಿ ಕ್ಷಾ ದಾಳ್ಳಿದ್ದ ಚಿಕಾಂ ಗಿ ರಂ ವಂದ್ದ

ಈ ರತ ರ್ಕಾರ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರದ ಶಾಲ್ಲ ಕಾ ಲಾಂ ರಾಂ ಆಗ್ಗಿದಾಂ ಧ್ವಂಧಿ
ಪಿ ಡ್ಯಾಂಗ್ಳಿಲಾಬ್ಲಾ ಲಂಗಿ ಗಿದ ಕ್ಷಗ್ಳಿಕೆ ಚಿಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಲಿ ಧೂಂ ಧಾರಣ ಗಿ ಶೆ
ವ ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಗಿ ಕಾಂಡಿಸೆಂ ಂಗಿ ಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಸ, ಕ್ಲಿಂಗಿ ಗಡಿ ಕ್ಲೈ ಗಳಂ ದಾ ಗಾ
ಕೊಂ ವಿಲು ಚಿಚಿಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾಂ ಇಲ್ಲಾ ಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಲಿ

ನಾವು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಾರಂಭ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಸೇರಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಹೋಗಿ ಸೇರಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣವೆಂದರೆ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಕಾರ್ಯಾರಂಭ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಸಭೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮೊದಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ

64 189

No. 2587

Name of Petitioner, పైడింటికి తిరుపతి నివాసి

Village, తిరుపతి పట్టణం

Taluk,

District, చిత్తూరు

Date of Arzi, 6 / 96

Date of Receipt, 20 / 1 / 96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, ఆర్జీ —

To Mr Dame Singh Ju 37/1/96

Subd

Previous references were sent to L. R. Branch

To L R Branch

4/2/96

ABSTRACT.

తిరుపతి పట్టణానికి సంబంధించి [illegible]
[illegible] 10.12.95 [illegible]
[illegible] 359 [illegible]
[illegible]

SUPERINTENDENT
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 20879/96
DATE 20-1-96

Lt. Asst. Com. Dept. Ltr.
Diplomat Enclosure
No. 314 dt. 9-1-96
Rec'd on 17-1-96

14/1/96 (6)

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಯಸಿಂಹ ಕಂಠಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ

ಆತ್ಮೀಯ ಜಯಸಿಂಹ,

ಬಹಳ ದಿನಗಳಿಂದ ನಿನ್ನ ಪತ್ರ ಬಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರಣ ಏನೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿನ್ನ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿತು. ಈಗ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ? ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಗುಣಮುಖವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಕೆಟ್ಟಾಗ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬೇಸರವಾಗುವುದು ಸಹಜ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆದರಿ ಕೂರಬಾರದು

Dept. Revenue
File No 31-95
Serial No 3

795-8 8/6/1/96
174-94
R/ 1806
2 drafts

To The D.C. Comm.r
Mysore Dt.

Sir,

With reference to Govt. Order dt 14 November 1895 No 992 about the acquisition of the land near the Sandal Depot at Seringapatam, I am to request that you will be so good as to carry out the same at your very early convenience.

I have &c

for Secl Secy
Revd 10/1/96

Draft has been written

This is the No that is in the file & the Dewan's letter alluded to therein was not received in this branch. Vd.
1.1.94

From the same No 843
23/1/96 R 218.

(8)

(37)

General No. 1744/96

OFFICE OF THE
6094
27 JAN 1896
L. 2118
FWAN OF MYSORE

Section Mysore
File No 21-95
Serial No 4

From The Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District

To The General Secretary to the Govt of Mysore.

Dated 23rd January 1896

Despatched

Received

General No.
No. 843

Enclosure No. Petition

Where is the Rule as received 29/1/96

Replies to letter No. 7958 / 1744 regarding certain improvements in Seringapatam

Memo with G.O. 1744/95 dated 5th ultimo forwarded

D.C. 29/1/96

If the land measurements for 432 why does the Dy Com. propose to pay 545 Rs. Reply to letter with enclosures. Note this recommendation. 29/1/96

G 27-1-96
L7

Submitted for orders.
27/1

No 643
Edu. Petition No. 1707

The Accumulpiones' office
Mpone District

Dated Mpone 23rd January 1896

From

The Dyb Accumulpioner
of the Mpone District

To,

The General Secretary to the
Government of Mpone

Sir

With reference to para 14 of the Dewan's memo of the 14th October 1895 a Copy of which was received with Assistant Secretary Mr. Seerkantéswara Iyer's memo (bearing neither number nor date), Your official memo No Pet/992 of the 14th November 1895 Calling attention to the above and your letter No 7958/27174-94 of the 16th January 1896 Calling for prompt reply to the same, I beg to state as follows:-

2 In the above said para it has been directed that the vacant site to the west of the Sandal Koti at Serungapatam should be acquired and reserved for public purposes. The Site formerly belonged to Government. About 10 years ago it was sold by lots to some persons on the Condition that

the

they should build on them within the time specified in the sale lists. Immediately there-after, Sirumal mestri bought them all from the original purchasers. He too did not build on the site. After his death it was sold by a civil court in satisfaction of a decree. On hearing this the Vice President of the Serungapetta municipality issued a notice to the purchaser of the court sale that he should not interfere with the land as the condition on which it had been sold by the municipality had been violated by reason of the site not having been built on within the time stipulated. Thereupon the purchaser at the Court sale managed to transfer the site back to Sirumal mestries heirs. They then sold it to the present owner Purohit Sreenivasa Iyengar for Rupees 432 in October 1894. Although the sale deed is in the name of Sreenivasiengar alone he and 6 others jointly bought the land and paid for it as admitted by Sreenivasiengar. Nine persons are interested in it. Out of them 5, viz Sirumarriengar, Venkatachar, Narasimhar, Sreerengaraj Bhatt and Sreenivasiengar have agreed to take the amount referred to by the Dewan

in the above mentioned para of this memo viz 545 Rupees the 6th Narasimachar is absent. The 4th viz Poorohit Sreenivasiengar in whose name the sale deed stands claims 795 Rupees as per particulars noted below

Rupees 432-0-0 The price of the land
10-0-0 Cost of stamp paper and registration fees
250-0-0 The amount advanced to workmen engaged for buildings on the site.
103-0-0 Interest on the above amounts at 12 per cent per annum from the date of purchase viz October 1894

Total 795-0-0

3 The claim of Poorohit Sreenivas Iyengar to 250 Rupees advanced to workmen who have not as yet worked off the advance seems unreasonable. The value of the work done has been estimated at about Rs 39/-

4 I think that the 1st & 2nd ~~and 4th~~ items of this claim amounting to 442 Rupees plus cost of work done viz Rupees 39 and interest thereon from the date of purchase to the date of payment at 12 per cent per annum may be paid. All this will be within the amount referred to by the Dewan.

Seems that power to resume the land decreed to the Municipality when the time granted for building on the site expired, Poorohit Seenivasiengar ought to be glad to accept this amount, but he has declined to do so Under these Circumstances I beg to know if the land may be resumed without any Compensation by reason of the violation of the Condition of the grant or Steps taken to acquire it as per Land acquisition Regulation

5 The petition received with the 2d of the above references quoted, is herewith returned

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant
[signature]
Dy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

Complied
Dy.

The Entire land not
be resumed by the Govt as the Condition
of the Grant has not been fulfilled -
As I am informed by the Vice President of the Municipal
Council (the ~~President~~ Vice President of the Municipal
Limits.) ~~I~~ issued a notice to the purchaser
in a Court auction not to interfere with
the land as the said Condition has been
Vio violated. The ~~Petitioner~~ petitioner has
only got grants subject to
this & Govt to which does not
this by the latter in any way affect

Resumed
6/8/96

Dropped
Dy 7/8/96

forfeiture as the result of the non fulfilment of the

~~The~~ Condition will be
enforced in the hands of
the present owners whose
title is derived from
the purchaser by the Crown
~~the~~ a re-purchase from the
~~Grantee~~ subsequent Sale by
the Crown Grantee & subsequent
Sale by the latter to others —
The land herein referred to
the Deputy Commissioner is authorized
to lease ~~the Vendor~~ and to
lease or an act of grace to the
Petitioner of any of them upon
the receiving within a month
the upon the same
more of the Crown will be created
both to the Treasury

5/8/96

Rs 545

(14

From

The General Secretary to the
Govt. of Mysore.

Section Revenue ... To
Ir No 21-95 ...
Serial No 5 ...

The Dy Commr.
Tyagore dt.

Dated 4/2/96
Despatched
Received

General No 8984
No 174-94

Enclosure No.

R 21/2

His letter 23rd January 1896 No 843 reporting on the acquisition of the land near the Sandal Kote at Seringapatam

In the letter quoted alone, it is stated that although the Sale deed is in the name of Porobit Sri-nivasiengar alone, he & 6 others jointly bought the land and paid for it. In a subsequent part of

the latter it is stated
that Sriniwasiengar
& 4 others have agreed
to take the amount
referred to by the Dewan
viz Rs 545.

It should be clearly stated whether Rs 545 is proposed to be paid to each of the claimants or to Sriniwasiengar alone on account of all of them. Boy Dodd

3/1/10

For Secd Secy

(581)

(16)

Gen. 31]

1896 OF THE

L 6487

L 2266

From The Commissioner Mysore District.

To The Genl. Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Dated 5th February 1896.

Despatched

Received

General No.

No. 952

Enclosure No.

The land in question was granted to Krishnaraya for services rendered in accordance with the terms of the Sanad dated 27th ... The Sanad fixes the Compensation at 5-4-5 per annum in lieu of the land & the work done thereon. The Kasi Co. Pharaos agree; Krishnaraya does not, & the land has escheated to Govt as the result of Krishnaraya having failed to comply with the condition of the grant originally made by Govt viz to build houses within a fixed time & the payment of Compensation is therefore a matter of grace. The Dy Com's proposes to pay the Kasi Co. Pharaos their portion of 5-4-5 Rds & to declare as regards Krishnaraya who is refractory that the land was forfeit to Govt owing to non compliance with original condition of grant. The proceedure is approved.

Govt to Consult

1572/

To the 1st Comm

12/2

As the matter was settled personally during the Durbar I am unable to advise

12/2/96

Stating that it is proposed to pay the amount of compensation for the lands near the Sandal Kotai at Seringapatam to all the seven individuals interested in the land in proportion to the extent of their interest.

LBB 7-2-96

Submitted BRG 8/2/96

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Mysore District,
Dated Mysore 5th February 1896.

To

The General etary to the Government
of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 8984 / L.F. 174.94 dated the 4th February 1896, I beg to state that as already reported in this Office letter No. 843 of the 23rd January 1896, the site to the west of the Sandal Kobi at Seringapatam has been bought in the name of Poorohit Sreenivasiengar on behalf of himself and six others viz. Tirunarriengar, Venkatachar, Narasimachar, Sreerungarajbhatta, Sreenivasiengar and Narasimachar. The first five of these six persons have agreed to take the amount fixed by the Dewan. The sixth is absent and so he could not be asked. Poorohit Sreenivasiengar wants more than what the Dewan has fixed. It will thus be seen that out of the 7 persons interested, five have agreed to the amount offered, one demands a higher amount and one is absent. It is proposed to pay the amount of compensation to all the seven individuals interested in the land in proportion

to

to the extent of their interest.

I have the honor to be

Your most obt servant.

M. Venkatarangaiya

Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

Compd
ucly

189

No. 3493

Name of Petitioner, Purohit-Srinivasayya

Village, residing at

Taluk, Srirangapatna

District, Mysore

Date of Arzi, 7-3-96

Date of Receipt, 10-4-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

States that nearly two years have elapsed since he was asked not to construct buildings on the vacant site he has purchased to the West of the Land Kotte at Srirangapatna as the same was required for Post purposes - that nothing has been decided in the matter although several petitions were addressed - that by this they have been put to heavy loss - that the Dy. Comr came and inspected the Spot on 19-1-96 - that nothing has been done in the matter although two months have elapsed that the creditors dun him for pay that if the site is actually required by Govt it might be taken by paying its price and other costs - Prays that Govt is not required by Govt Early termination may be granted to the construction of buildings on the site

I & R Branch

N.S.
12/4/96

"Re-petition No 174 of 94 bearing on the subject is pending disposal before the Dewan."

Dy 5/5/96 -

4/5/96

Submitted
7/5/96

Dy

Submitted
7-5-96

Sir

Submitted
11/5/96.

Place this in the file of the Court of Dewan
for orders
11-5-96

with private Secretary
No. 176 dated 31.3.96

MYSORE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG. No. 3493 OF
DATE 10-4-96

3493

No. 2846.

Name of Petitioner, Ramaswami

Village, Sheranpalaiyam

Taluk, Sheranpalaiyam

District, Trichy.

Date of Arzi, 17th July 196

Date of Receipt, 18th July 196

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

State that the land site near the Sandal hotel which they had purchased from Venkatachala Naicker has been taken for Rs 435 under the orders of the Divisional Revenue Officer for road use — and the Deputy Collector has not given them the value of it — Tho they applied repeatedly for it — Consequently they pray that orders may be given for the payment of Rs 700 due to them on account of said land

Now, it is forwarded to the Dy. Collector for disposal

A
S.
12/7/96

Municipal Branch for recs

S
22/7/96

For the petitioner's land in S.No. 174, 94 in the village of Sheranpalaiyam has been taken up for the Municipal road vide D.O. No. 22966 - 96 dated 31/7/96

Submitted DO for 23/7/96

Send to the Secy
CL
23/7

Send
I think we called for some information in this case the other day - Give them one. After that information is received

19-8-96

Draft Endorsement submitted similar to that issued to Perumal Srinivasan DO 19/8/96

(12)

Bangalore
18/7/96

284

284 R
18-7-96.

(93)

Gen. 31

1896

From

46

Section Mysore
No. 21-96
Subject No. 9

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Distt

Dated
Despatched 14th August 1896
Received

General No. 2242
Z. No. 174-94

Enclosure No.

His letter c/o 843 dated
23 January 1896

With reference to the above has the honor to request that the Dy Comr will be so good as to ombmit at an early date the original sale lists of the sale to the west of the Sandalkote at Seringapatam and other papers, if any

prescribing the condition, that the site will, if not built upon within a fixed time, be resumed & forfeited to Government. The notice given by the Vice President to the purchaser at the auction sale, that he should not interfere with the land owing to the violation of the condition of the grant by the original ~~purchaser~~ grantee, should also be submitted as early as ~~convenient~~ possible

By order

12/8/96

~~General~~ Secy

No. 473
Enclosures No. Vernacular record —

95

L. 508
2320

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 3rd September 896.

Received 8 Sept
No. 21-95
Year No. 12

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

SIR,

As called for in your docket No. 2242 L.F. 174-94 of the 14th August 1896, I beg to submit herewith the original papers relating to the sale of the site to the west of the Sandalkoti at Seringapatam. In the notice of sale and also in the sale list, the condition that houses should be built on the sites within the time given is stated. The record also contains the notice issued to the purchasers by the Vice President of the Seringapatam Municipality on the 12th June 1885 to the effect that as they had violated the said condition their claim to the sites had become extinguished. When subsequent to this, these sites were attached by the creditors of Viramalmestry, who had bought them also from the purchasers, notice was given to the purchaser at the Civil Court sale that the sites had reverted to Government.



i.e. Municipality) that notice is not with us, but with the person to whom it was given.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obdt. servant,
[signature]
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

MM

(27) 50

Read again letter No 843 dated 23rd January 1896 from the Dy Comr of the Mysore Dis submitting a detailed report in regard to the sale to the trust of the Sandalkote at Seringapatam; stating that Purohit Sreenivasrengar declined to accept the amount offered and requesting instructions as to whether the land may be resumed without any compensation, in consequence of the violation of the condition of the grant or whether it may be acquired as per Land Acquisition Regulation.

Section Mysore
File No 21-95
Serial No - H - -

Read Letter No 952 dated 5th February 1896 from the same officer stating, with reference to this office No 8984 / L.F.174-94 dated 4th February 1896 that 5 out of 7 persons interested in the land, have agreed to accept the

Dy 559
3719-20
174-94
8/7/96
This file & V. papers to DC

the compensation offered
and one demands a hegher
amount and one is absent
and that compensation was
proposed to be paid to all
the seven individuals.

Letter Cl 4733 of 3/9/96 from
the same office submitting the work a cular papers in connection with
the sete to the west of the
Sundalkote

Order thereon

The entire land
should be resumed by
the Govt. as the condition
of the grant had not been
fulfilled. The Amildar (who
is Vice President of the
Seringapatam municipality) issued
a notice to the purchaser in
a court action not to
interfere with the land,
as the said condition had
been violated. Forfeiture
as the result of the non fulfil-
ment of this condition should
be enforced in the hands of
the

39

the present alleged owners whose title is derived a repurchaser from the by the original grantee. auction purchaser ~~x~~ and subsequent sale by the latter to others. The land being resumed to Government the Dy Comr is authorized to pay Rs 5·4·5· to the Petitioners as an act of grace, from the general revenues. If any of them refuses to receive within a month his share of the amount the same will be credited back to the Treasury.

These following words occurring after "x" are omitted in the draft. "by the original grantee"

9/6

Secretary

To,

The Dy Comrs. Mysore Distt,
Comptroller

Recording the C Pay
received with Lr dd
47383/9/96

WO 6028

the present resumption is not
sustained. If the rule is req'd for
a public purpose will it
be levy

ATT
8/8/96

draft rules 11/8/96

Draft for approval
DMG

Called Bill
7-8-96

Is there any thing to show that when the rule was made 10 yrs ago it was made on the express condition that it not be built upon within a fixed time the rule will be removed after that? Let me see the orgl rule best of them my only doubt is that even if there was such a condition there has been a waiver on the part of Govt and ATT 8/8/96

No. 3721

Ft. 174-94

(31) RL 560 (5)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

17/9/ 1896

Endorsement granted to Purohit Srinivasacharyar and others praying for permission to build on the vacant site to the west of Sandal at Seringapatam ~~to build on the vacant site~~ ~~284, 646~~ and 3493 in reply to their Petitions Registered Nos. 1472, 1707, 2587 dated 15 October and 6 November 1895 and 6 January and 7 March 1896 respectively

Petitioners are informed that their land having forfeited to Government owing to the non-fulfillment of the conditions of its grant, the Deputy Commissioner has been authorized to pay Rs 545 to the Petitioners as an act of grace and that if any of them refuse to receive within a month his share of the amount, the same will be credited back to the Treasury.

Rural
24-95
12

"By Order"

~~Chief~~ Secretary.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-94—2000.

Draft
7-8-96

4141
174-94

(33)

5

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
Local Boards
PETITION DEPARTMENT,

24/9/96

Reminder

Endorsement granted to Ramaswamy Sivanara
Naigangar & others praying for permission to
build on the Vacant site to the west of Sanvallabha
at Perumgalpatan
in reply to their Petition Registered No. 284 & 646 dated 9 17 July
L.137 L.400
13 August 1896

Petitioner is informed that are their land Rang, forfeited
to Govt owing to the non-fulfilment of the Con-
ditions of its grant; the Dy Comr has been
authorised to pay Rs 545 to the Petitioners
(seven persons in all)
(as an act of grace & that if any of them
refuse to receive within a month his share
of the amount, the same will be credited back
to the Treasury

Who are the 7 persons to
whom the 545 Rs was
awarded? Does it mean
mean that the 2 petitioners
here & 5 others all of
whom?
21/9

By Order,
for Chief Secretary.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.